

Remarks

The Office Action mailed September 29, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 15, 16, and 18-51 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-14 and 17 have been canceled. Claims 15, 16, 18-23, and 32 stand rejected. Claims 17, 24-31, and 33-37 are objected to. Claims 38-51 are newly added. Applicants believe that no additional fee for the newly added Claims is required.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), a two month extension of time is submitted herewith to extend the due date of the response to the Office Action dated September 29, 2005, for the above-identified patent application from December 29, 2005, through and including February 28, 2006. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), authorization to charge a deposit account in the amount of \$225.00 to cover this extension of time request also is submitted herewith.

The objection to the specification is respectfully traversed.

Claims 26, 28, and 30 have been amended to address the issues noted in the Office Action. For the reason set forth, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 22 and 23 have each been amended to depend from Claim 21, thereby addressing the antecedent basis issues noted in the Office Action. For the reason set forth, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejections of Claims 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 15, 18, 20, 21, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rehmat et al. (6,410,283) ("Rehmat") is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 has been amended to include the recitations of former Claim 17, which was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable over Rehmat.

Claims 18, 20, 21, and 32 depend from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 18, 20, 21, and 32 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 18, 20, 21, and 32 likewise are patentable over Rehmat.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 15, 18, 20, 21, and 32 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rehmat in view of Santina et al. (4,750,454) (“Santina”) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 depends from independent Claim 15, which is submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above. When the recitations of Claim 16 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 16 likewise is patentable over Rehmat in view of Santina.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 16 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rehmat in view of Capener et al. (4,344,770) (“Capener”) is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19, 22, and 23 depend from independent Claim 15, which is submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above. When the recitations of Claims 19, 22, and 23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 19, 22, and 23 likewise are patentable over Rehmat in view of Capener.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 19, 22, and 23 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 17, 24-31, and 33-37 is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 15 is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons given above. Claim 17 has been canceled. Claims 36-37 depend from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 36-37 are considered in combination with the recitations of independent Claim 15, Applicants submit that Claims 36-37 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claim 24, indicated as being allowable, has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 25-31 depend from independent Claim 24. When the recitations of Claims 25-31 are considered in combination with the recitations of independent Claim 24, Applicants submit that Claims 25-31 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claim 33 has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 33 is indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 34-35 depend from independent Claim 33. When the recitations of Claims 34-35 are considered in combination with the recitations of independent Claim 33, Applicants submit that Claims 34-35 are likewise in condition for allowance.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the objection to Claims 17, 24-31, and 33-37 be withdrawn.

Newly added Claims 38-44 depend from independent Claim 24. When the recitations of these claims are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 24, Applicants submit that Claims 38-44 likewise are patentable over the cited art.

Newly added Claims 45-51 depend from independent Claim 33. When the recitations of these claims are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 33, Applicants submit that Claims 45-51 likewise are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert E. Slenker
Registration No. 45,112
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070